

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

RACHEL MARIE WHITTED,

Case No. 3:21-cv-00102-MMD-WGC

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

PERRY RUSSELL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by Plaintiff Rachel Marie Whitted, a former state prisoner. On August 17, 2021, this Court issued an order directing Whitted to file her updated address with this Court by September 17, 2021. (ECF No. 9.) The deadline has now expired, and Whitted has not filed her updated address or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

1 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey
2 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:
3 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to
4 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring
5 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.
6 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at
7 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

8 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously
9 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of
10 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of
11 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay
12 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*
13 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring
14 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of
15 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey
16 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"
17 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d
18 at 1424. The Court's order requiring Whitted to file her updated address with the Court by
19 September 17, 2021, expressly stated: "It is further ordered that, if Plaintiff fails to timely
20 comply with this order, this case will be subject to dismissal without prejudice." (ECF No.
21 9 at 2.) Thus, Whitted had adequate warning that dismissal would result from her
22 noncompliance with the Court's order to file her updated address by September 17, 2021.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on
2 Whitted's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this Court's August 17,
3 2021, order.

4 The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case.

5 DATED THIS 20th Day of September 2021.



MIRANDA M. DU
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE